FILED	ÁQ
BY: The	
DI.	4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 -

2017 FEB 24 PM 4: 43

VIRLYNH TINHELL SUPERIOR COURT CLERF

Gerald T. Gavin
State Bar No. 013842
Julia Cassels
State Bar No. 021578

3880 Stockton Hill Road, Suite 103-450 Kingman, Arizona 86409

Email: geraldgavinlaw@gmail.com

Telephone: (480) 233-6038

Attorneys for Justin Rector

# IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA

## IN AND FOR COUNTY OF MOHAVE

STATE OF ARIZONA,	)	CR2014-01193
	)	
PLAINTIFF,	)	
	)	
v.	)	DEFENDANT JUSTIN RECTOR'S
	)	MEMORANDUM REGARDING
JUSTIN JAMES RECTOR,	)	ADEQUATE PREPARATION
	)	TIME
DEFENDANT.	)	
	)	HONORÁBLE LEE JANTZEN

Pursuant to Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure 8.2(a)(4), 8.2(d) and 8.5(a) and (b), United States Constitution Amendments V, VI, VII, XIV, Arizona Constitution Article 2, §§ 4, 13, and 24, the American Bar Association Guidelines for the Appointment and Performance of Defense Counsel in Death Penalty Cases, *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668 (1984), and the interests of justice, Justin James Rector, through undersigned counsel, moves this Court to permit



counsel adequate time to comply with their ethical obligations to vigorously defend this capital case.

## PROCEDURAL HISTORY

First chair counsel, Gerald Gavin, was appointed on this matter in March of 2015. Ron Gilleo was assigned as second chair counsel. A conflict of interest arose which required Mr. Gilleo to be relieved from further responsibility early in 2016. Julia Cassels was contacted regarding her availability to handle the case in his stead in February of 2016. Ms. Cassels agreed to accept the appointment and spoke with Mr. Blake Schritter to that effect on March 2, 2016.

In early March of 2016, Mr. Gavin conferred with the Court regarding Ms. Cassels' appointment, noting that Ms. Cassels was prepared to proceed and qualified to do so, but for completion of the hours of Continuing Legal Education required in the year just prior to appointment. Mr. Gavin informed the Court that said training is offered very sporadically during the year and that the next opportunity would be in late June of 2016 at the Arizona Public Defender's Association Conference held in Tempe, Arizona. Ms. Cassels submitted the required documents to Indigent Defense Services ("IDS") and enrolled in the training in March.

After attending the training, Ms. Cassels timely submitted the documentation of completion to the Contract Administrator, was appointed to the matter, and her Notice of Appearance was submitted to the Court on July 9, 2016.

Ms. Cassels received an electronic version of the file within a few days and began diligently reviewing its contents. There are in excess of twelve thousand (12,000) pages of documents as well as numerous recordings, both audio and video, that require her review. The sheer amount of material, as well as its complexity, requires repeated study.

Additionally, Ms. Cassels needed to begin developing a relationship with Mr. Rector via jail visitation which may only be done in Kingman, Arizona. Ms. Cassels has done so diligently and has developed an excellent rapport with Mr. Rector. Ms. Cassels also needed to develop relationships with the other team members and understand their roles and their progress to date. The assigned investigator, Mr. James Valdez, was appointed to the case near the same time as Ms. Cassels, so he was also challenged with developing rapport with the client and his family, reviewing the massive amount of documents, beginning his factual investigation nearly two years after the alleged date of offense, and assisting with mitigation tasks.

#### **ARGUMENT**

Due process embodies the fundamental notions of fairness and incorporates "safeguards which are fundamental rights and essential to a fair trial." *Specht v. Patterson*, 386 U.S. 605, 609-610 (1967). In capital cases, the Eighth Amendment requires heightened reliability because death is a qualitatively different punishment. *E.g.*, *Lockett v. Ohio*, 438 U.S. 586 at 604 (plurality opinion) (1978).

Thus the mere appearance or presence of counsel is not sufficient. See Ake v. Oklahoma, 470 U.S. 68, 77 (1985) ("mere access to the courthouse doors does not by itself assure a proper functioning of the adversary process, and that a criminal trial is fundamentally unfair if the [prosecution] proceeds against an indigent defendant without making certain that he has access to the raw materials integral to the building of an effective defense. Counsel must be able to safeguard their client's rights. Death penalty cases require duties, functions, and knowledge "definably different from those of counsel in ordinary cases." American Bar Association 2003 Guidelines for the Appointment and Performance of Defense Counsel in Death Penalty Cases, 31 Hofstra L. Rev. 913 at 922 ("2003 ABA Guidelines"). And the United States Supreme Court has made clear that in order to render effective assistance, counsel must have

14<sup>3</sup>

sufficient time to prepare competently for a case. See Powell v. Alabama, 287 U.S. 45 (1932).

Capital cases differ from other criminal cases in numerous ways. The possibility of death affects every phase of the litigation proceedings. It is beyond question that under the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments trial counsel is obligated to conduct a reasonable investigation. *E.g.*, *Strickland*, 466 U.S. at 673; *Wiggins*, 539 U.S. at 521-22. One of the "well defined norms" of capital representation requires attorneys in a capital case to immediately put in place plans for a punishment phase defense. The duty to investigate includes the essential tasks of looking into known leads and possible avenues of mitigation, and gathering records. *E.g.*, *Rompilla v. Beard*, 545 U.S. 374, 382-83 (2005). As the United States Supreme Court has explained, "the American Bar Association Standards for Criminal Justice . . . describe[] the obligation in terms no one could misunderstand":

"It is the duty of the lawyer to conduct a prompt investigation of the circumstances of the case and to explore all avenues leading to facts relevant to the merits of the case and the penalty in the event of conviction. The investigation should always include efforts to secure information in the possession of the prosecution and law enforcement authorities."

Rompilla, 545 U.S. at 387 (quoting ABA Standards for Criminal Justice 4–4.1 (2d ed. 1982 Supp.)).

The United States Supreme Court considers the ABA guidelines to be the "well-defined norms" established for defense counsel in capital cases. Wiggins v. Smith, 539 U.S. 510, 524 (2003). Because the sentencer in a capital case must consider in mitigation "anything in the life of a defendant which might militate against the appropriateness of the death penalty for that defendant," "penalty phase preparation requires extensive and generally unparalleled investigation into personal and family history." American Bar Association 2003 Guidelines for the Appointment and Performance of Defense Counsel in Death Penalty Cases, 31 Hofstra L. Rev. 913 at 1022 ("2003 ABA Guidelines"). According to the ABA, counsel must explore:

- (1) Medical history (including hospitalizations, mental and physical illness or injury, alcohol and drug use, pre-natal and birth trauma, malnutrition, developmental delays, and neurological damage);
- (2) Family and social history (including physical, sexual, or emotional abuse; family history of mental illness, cognitive impairments, substance abuse, or domestic violence; poverty, familial instability, neighborhood environment, and peer influence); other traumatic events such as exposure to criminal violence, the loss of a loved one, or a natural disaster; [and]
- (3) experiences of racism or other social or ethnic bias; cultural or religious influences; failures of government or social intervention (e.g., failure to intervene or provide necessary services, placement

in poor quality foster care or juvenile detention facilities); Educational history (including achievement, performance, behavior, and activities), special educational needs (including cognitive limitations and learning disabilities) and opportunity or lack thereof, and activities;....

*Id.* at 1022-1023.

Effective assistance of counsel is ultimately concerned with the fundamental right to a fair trial, "a trial whose result is reliable." *Id.* at 687. An integral part of the penalty phase of a capital trial is the Eighth Amendment's demand that all relevant evidence bearing on a defendant's character, propensities, and background be considered by the sentencer in determining the appropriateness of the penalty. *Lockett*, at 605. Penalty phase investigations in capital cases should include inquiries into social background and evidence of family abuse, potential mental impairment, physical health history, and any history of drug and alcohol abuse. *Summerlin v. Schriro*, 427 F.3d 623, 630 (9th Cir. 2005) (en banc).

Given this wide array of areas that *must* be explored to protect a defendant's fundamental due process rights, capital cases quite simply take time to be done right. "Studies have consistently found that defending capital cases requires vastly more time and effort by counsel than noncapital matters." 2003 ABA Guidelines at 967. One study found that defense attorneys in federal capital cases billed for over twelve times as many hours as in noncapital homicide

cases. In terms of actual hours invested in the defense of capital cases, recent studies indicate that several thousand hours are typically required to provide appropriate representation. For example, an in-depth examination of federal capital trials from 1990 to 1997 conducted on behalf of the Judicial Conference of the United States found that the total attorney hours per representation in capital cases that actually proceeded to trial averaged 1,889. (967-68). 2003 ABA Guidelines at 967-68. In September of 2010, the Arizona Supreme Court amended Rule 8.2(a)(4), Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure, and extended the time that capital cases were sought to be tried from 18 months from arraignment, to two years from the State's notice of intent to seek the death penalty. (R. 10-0012). This rule change expresses a tacit recognition that substantial time is required to adequately investigate, prepare, and try a capital case.

Because mitigation often covers difficult, and painful subjects, building a relationship of trust with the client is also integral to effective representation and cannot be created overnight. Effective representation requires client contact. "To the extent that jurisdictions impede such contact—whether by charging excessive fees for telephone calls, limiting mailings, failing to provide convenient and confidential arrangements for visits, restricting the access of non-attorney defense team members to clients, or otherwise—they jeopardize

the provision of high quality legal representation in accordance with these Guidelines." 2003 ABA Guidelines at 956. ABA Guideline 10.5 recognizes the importance of rapport to effective representation and requires that counsel must make every effort to maintain close contact with the client and build a relationship of trust. 2003 ABA Guidelines at 1005. "Establishing a relationship of trust with the client is essential both to overcome the client's natural resistance to disclosing the often personal and painful facts necessary to present an effective penalty phase defense, and to ensure that the client will listen to counsel's advice on important matters." Id. at 1008. The Court must allow counsel adequate time to build this relationship of trust. See also ABA Standards for Criminal Justice: Defense Function Standard 4-5.2 & cmt., in ABA Standards for Criminal Justice: Prosecution Function and defense Function (3d ed. 1993).

Denial of adequate time to prepare a case for trial may deny the defendant a "substantial right." *State v. Narten*, 99 Ariz. 116, 120, 407 P.2d 81, 83 (1965) (internal citations omitted). Given the circumstances of this case, if this court denies counsel adequate time to prepare this complex capital case, Mr. Rector will suffer prejudice and a denial of his state and federal constitutional rights. *See State v. Amaya Ruiz*, 166, Ariz. 152, 164, 800 P.2d 1260, 1272 (1990); *State* 

v. Williams, 144 Ariz. 433, 441, 698 P.2d 686 (1985); State v. Sullivan, 130 Ariz. 213, 215, 635 P.2d 501, 503 (1981).

### CONCLUSION

"Death is a different kind of punishment from any other which may be imposed in this country." *Gardner v. Florida*, 430 U.S. 349, 357 (1977), *citing Gregg v. Georgia*, 428 U.S. 153, 181-88 (1976). Further, representation in "capital cases requires enormous amounts of time, energy, and knowledge. The field is increasingly complex and ever-changing." *2003 ABA Guidelines* at 1083. Through no fault of Mr. Rector, he experienced a change in counsel. Counsel must have adequate time to build a relationship with her client, and to prepare for the strenuous obligations a capital case imposes. Without adequate time, counsel cannot meet their obligations and are rendered ineffective.

Respectfully submitted this 24thday of Silmany 2017.

GERALD GAVIN

Counsel for Defendant

JULIA CASSELS Counsel for Defendant

1	Original filed this day of
2	hand-delivered to:
3 -	nand-derivered to:
	Clerk of the Court
4	Mohave County
5	401 E. Spring Street
6	Kingman, Arizona 86401
7	Honorable Lee Jantzen
8	401 E. Spring Street, 2d Floor
9	Kingman, Arizona 86401
	Mr. Care M. D. III
10	Mr. Greg McPhillips
11	Assigned Deputy County Attorney Mohave County Attorney's Office
12	PO Box 7000
13	Kingman, Arizona 86401
14	Mr. Justin Rector
15	Mohave County Jail
16	Client File
17	Cheff Pile
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	. '
23	
24	
11	ı ,